



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

metrical introduction. Beside the proof of the later origin of at least the existing version which is furnished by the weakened final syllables and by the handwriting of the manuscript, the variation in the fragment shows unmistakable traces of Otfrid's influence. As I have attempted to show in another place (Beitr. 38, 47, ff.), Otfrid's development in style may be followed with considerable accuracy through a comparison of his use of variation in the several books. The styles of variation, for example, in I, 1 and I, 2 are so totally different as to leave no doubt as to which is the work of the experienced and which the work of the inexperienced author. In the same way it is possible to recognise in the author of the fragment the unskilled worker, who has however felt it his duty to follow the master's (Otfrid's) example.

The examples of variation in the fragment occur as follows:

(1) Lines 3, 5, *quena—uuîp*. (2) Ll. 5, 7, *sih ketrencean—thir geba trinken*. (3) Ll. 9b, 10, *Uuîp, obe thû uuiissîs, uuîelîh gotes gift ist, unte den ercantîs mit themo do kôsôtîs*. (4) Ll. 2, 12, *brunnon—buzza*. (5) Ll. 16, 17, *brunnan—uuazzer*. (6) Ll. 16, 17, *tranc—nuzzun*. (7) Ll. 19b, 20, *then lâzit der durst sin: iz sprangôt imo'n pruston in êuuôn mit luston*. (8) Ll. 23, 24, *uuir—commen*. (9) L. 25, *Uueiz ih daz dû uuâr segist, daz dû commen ne hebist*. (10) Ll. 29, 30, *for uns êr giborana betôtôn hiar in berega, Unser altmâga suotôn hia genâda*.

Examination shows that six examples (1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8) are mere variations of word or phrase—the simplest kind of variation. First thought might point to the conclusion that this style resembles the old epic variation and is hence a sign of early origin. Closer examination, however, proves that in no single instance do we have the typical asyndetic juxtaposition of epic variation—the hammer-like repetition so characteristic of *Beowulf* and *Hildebrand*. There is not a single instance of variation in the *Christus* fragment which shows even the faintest trace of epic influence. The reason for repetition is here quite another—namely the existence of identical or kindred word or phrase

pairs in the Latin source (1. *mulier, mulier*; 2. *bibere, bibere*; 4. *fons, puteus*; 8. *vir, vir*). Only in 5 and 6 is the variation independent of the source and in both cases it is doubtless dictated by metric and stylistic reasons. Such variations as those just given are typically Otfridian and point unmistakably to his influence on the author of the fragment. Equally true to the same model are the longer variations 3, 7 and 9, being mere translations of the source, made with typical monastic fidelity. Number 10, however, is an independent attempt at variation, although the similarity of phrasing to Otfrid 11, 14, 57–58 renders it probable that the monk of Weissenburg was here also carefully studied.

From the above analysis it becomes apparent that the fragment is not an inheritance from an early period of Old High German, since the technique of its variation bears no resemblance to that of the epic period, as is for instance the case with the earlier work of Otfrid himself (cf. I, 2). This fact and its stylistic similarity with the greater work, give further confirmation to the reasons already advanced for regarding the fragment as the attempt of a successor and imitator of Otfrid.

P. R. KOLBE.

Buchtel College.

Geoffrey Chaucer, by EMILE LEGOUIS. Translated by L. LAILAVOIX. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1913. xxxvi + 220 pp.

Mr. Lailavoix has placed English students and lovers of Chaucer under lasting obligations by this translation¹ of Professor Legouis' delightful book. The author himself has long been favorably known as scholar and critic in this country and England through his valuable studies on the life and poetry of William Wordsworth. While there is perhaps nothing especially new and original in the book before

¹The work of translation has been well done. On p. 64, l. 6, 'disyllabic' is an evident slip for *decasyllabic*. Otherwise I have noticed almost no errors or misprints.

us for the serious student of Chaucer, and while the very nature and plan of the work required the author to exclude from its pages the usual 'scholarly' apparatus of numerous references to the whole field of critical literature, it is nevertheless an excellent manual for the general reader and casual student who wish to have an attractive guide to assist them to a sufficient knowledge and a genuine appreciation of Chaucer's poetry. Moreover, it is up to date in every respect, and M. Legouis shows time and again that he is familiar with all that has been written about Chaucer by all the best students of the last twenty-five years. And while he generally accepts the conclusions of such special students as Sypherd, Young, Lowes, Emerson, Brown, Kittredge and others about the date, origin, etc., of the poems of Chaucer, he does not hesitate to disagree, occasionally, with any one or all of them. In such cases he always sets forth his own opinion modestly, but firmly and in a graceful and convincing manner.

The book is made up of a Preface of some thirty-five pages by the translator, six chapters of text, a Conclusion of four pages, an Appendix containing several specimens of M. Louis' French verse translations of Chaucer's poems, and an Index. The frontispiece is an excellent reproduction of "Geoffrey Chaucer, from the Oceleve ms., from a copy in the possession of Mr. John Munro." The book is well printed, but poorly bound. It is a pity that the publishers did not exert themselves a little more in binding up a book that is sure to become a popular handbook for Chaucer students.

Mr. Lailavoix's Preface is a valuable addition to the work. It is written in a fine, flexible, flowing style, such as only a native Frenchman with Mr. Lailavoix's mastery of the English language and literature could write. Striking Gallicisms both here and in the text are of rare occurrence. But the special interest of the Preface lies in the succinct and comprehensive account it contains of Chaucer in France. This is the first and only attempt, with which the present writer is acquainted, at a historical survey, in English, of the slow but persistent growth of what may be called a genu-

ine Chaucer cult, as it existed among French scholars of the nineteenth century. Mr. Lailavoix, to be sure, gives credit for the facts he presents to the not yet accessible *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion* of Miss Caroline F. E. Spurgeon. He shows, however, in his use of the facts his own familiarity with Chaucer studies in both English and French literature,—though one wonders why he did not utilize the wealth of bibliographical materials so carefully collected by Miss Eleanor P. Hammond in her *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual* (Macmillan, 1908), nor even refer to this well-known book.

Chaucer the man, according to Mr. Lailavoix (p. vi), "was no doubt known of a few in France, such as Machaut and Deschamps" in the latter years of the fourteenth century. "But Chaucer, the poet, was not looked upon as a master of verse, as a creator, from whose works anything could be learnt." The "one solitary instance of a Frenchman (in the fifteenth century) who was well acquainted with Chaucer and counted the *Canterbury Tales* amongst his favourite books," "was Jean d'Orléans, Comte d'Angoulême, brother to Charles d'Orléans, the 'courtly maker.'" He was kept in an English prison for thirty-three years (1412 to 1445) by the Clarence family, and it was probably through one of his gaolers, "William Pole, Earl of Suffolk," or his own brother Charles that he became acquainted with the *Canterbury Tales*. But almost no references are found to Chaucer or his works in French literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There is a very brief record of "Geoffroy Chaucer, called the English Homer on account of his fine Verse" in Louis Moréri's *Grand Dictionnaire Historique* (1674), at which the readers "must have experienced no little surprise" (p. x). And Mr. Lailavoix does not think the French interest in Chaucer during the eighteenth century was so much due to the Protestant journals printed at the Hague—a view generally held—as to the publication by a Swiss, Bêat de Muralt, of his *Lettres sur les Anglais et les Français* in the year 1725. "They came upon the French like a thunderbolt, and incensed their national

pride to an incredible degree by the assertion they contained, that English literature was superior to French literature, and English character and intellect correspondingly finer" (p. xvi).

Voltaire in his *Lettres Philosophiques ou Lettres Anglaises* (1734) and the Abbé Prévost through his journal *Le Pour et Contre* make a few incidental references to Chaucer. But it was by means of "the dissertations of Yart, Trochereau, and Chauffepié" that the French public in the first half of the eighteenth century became familiar with the name of the great English poet. The first of these significant contributions was the *Idée de la Poésie Angloise, ou Traduction des meilleurs Poètes Anglois, qui n'ont point encore paru dans notre Langue* (1749) by the Abbé Yart. It is a "sort of miscellany containing poems by Philips, Swift, and Pope," and translations of several English critical appreciations. "The seventh volume contains a 'Discourse on Tales,' a 'Life of Chaucer,' and a translation of Dryden's 'Palamon and Arcite.'" In his personal appreciation of the *Canterbury Tales* the Abbé says, among other things: "What is really original in Chaucer is the diversity of the characters who relate the tales, . . . he painted from nature their characters, their dress, their virtues, and vices, but nevertheless his portraits are so strange, so peculiar, his characters so unpleasant and indecent, his satire so cruel and profane that, despite the artistic concern which guided me in my translation, I cannot hope to have made them bearable."

By the middle of the eighteenth century Chaucer had "gained a sure foothold in France," as is shown by the fact that his name began to appear in dictionaries and encyclopaedias. But it was in the nineteenth century for the first time, especially between the years 1830 and 1900, that a really conscientious investigation of England's literary history was undertaken by numerous French scholars. "I counted between those dates," says Lailavoix, "no less than forty books, articles, or notices dealing with Chaucer. . . . They are not all of equal value, of course, but it must be admitted that this is a remarkable achieve-

ment." He then gives the titles of and he comments on several of the most important books on Chaucer that were published in France during the nineteenth century.

The titles of the several chapters of M. Legouis' work are as follows: Chap. I, The Poet's Biography; Chap. II, The Making of Chaucer as a Poet; Chap. III, The Allegorical Poems; Chap. IV, Chaucer and Italy; Chap. V, The *Canterbury Tales*: Sources and Composition; Chap. VI, The *Canterbury Tales*: a Literary Study. It would be interesting to take up these chapters separately and try to show by specific references and quotations the real character and quality of the work. But limited space and time force me to forego the task of doing this. I can, however, assure every student who enjoys reading good criticism and who wishes to obtain a fair, impartial, excellent picture of the poet, his works and times,—and all in comparatively few pages—that Legouis' book is one of the best ever printed on the subject.

The carping critic and the serious student of Chaucerian manuscript readings and of remote medieval sources of Chaucer's poems would doubtless be able to find occasional errors and omissions in Professor Legouis' work. But he did not write his book for such people,—he aimed at a very different and much larger public. He has placed before the reader all the facts of the poet's life in their proper relation to contemporary history. His criticism of the various poems is throughout broad, fair, sane and discriminating, sometimes enthusiastic, and always written in a beautiful and graceful style.

W. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

An Introduction to the French Classical Drama, by ELEANOR F. JOURDAIN. Oxford University Press, 1912. 208 pp.

This book may be used with profit by high-school and college students of French Classical tragedy. Its author has read Corneille and Racine with sympathy and understanding,